WHY DO THE HEATHEN RAGE ?

PROPERTY OF
ST. JOHN CANTIUS' SEMINARY
Congregation of the Resurrection.

Exposing the . . . .
Deliberate Falsifications
and Distortions of the
Bible, Talmud and other
Sacred Jewish Literature.

296
C678

by SAMUEL S. COHON
Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio

296
C678

296
C678

7560

St. John Cantius Seminary
3689 West Pine Boulevard
St. Louis, Mo.
296 7560
C678

WHY DO THE HEATHEN RAGE ?

Exposing the . . . . Deliberate Falsifications and Distortions of the Bible, Talmud and other Sacred Jewish Literature

by SAMUEL S. COHON
Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio

PROPERTY OF
ST. JOHN CANTIUS SEMINARY
Congregation of the Resurrection
WITHDRAWN

7560

CONTENTS

PAGE

Introduction 3

I. The Key to the Mystery 5

Cherchez les Juifs 7

Mystery Revealed 11

II. The Code of the Jew 15

Jewish Secrets 17

The Talmud and the Old Testament 21

The Talmud and Christ 22

The Jewish God 24

The Choice of Israel 25

Laws Against Idolatry 26

III. The Goyim 28

Shephoch 30

Depreciation of non-Jews 31

Injuring a Goy 33

Extolling Robbery of Gentiles 35

More Malicious Inventions 36

Non-Jewish Property 40

Destroying Churches 41

IV. Annulment of Vows 42

Kol Nidre 43

Conclusion: Jewish Ethics 46

INTRODUCTION

"Antisemitism," wrote the great Christian thinker Leo Tolstoy, "is a mad passion, akin to the lowest perversities of diseased human nature. It is the will to hate." It is a special form of the widespread evil which divides humanity into hostile camps. Sporadic bitterness is consciously roused and cultivated into a "philosophy" of life. Fanatics and cranks have espoused it as an ideal. Unscrupulous political parties have exploited it as an effective instrument of reaction. One great nation, with a proud record of cultural achievement, has openly espoused this madness and made it the official policy of the government, seeking to build national unity on the hatred of the Jews. Another nation has followed suit. Other European lands too have been deeply affected by this disease.

The U. S. A. and Canada have not wholly escaped this aberration. Here, too, men of ill-will have been deliberately developing it for sinister ends. They are engaged in the sordid business of reviving medieval prejudices and bigotry. To the peddler of narcotics are added purveyors of religious and racial animosity. Thus far the agents of malice have been recruited from the strong sex. Now members of the gentle sex have joined their unholy company. Under the name of "The Montreal Women's Anti-Communist League" they have banded themselves together to fight not only a particular political ideology but the whole Jewish people as well; to upset the friendly and cordial relations that exist between Christians and Jews and to sow among them the seed of suspicion, discord and strife. The mutual respect and cooperation that should prevail among neighbors is poisoned by deliberate trouble-makers.

When the name of an individual is besmirched, he has recourse to the law. Groups have no such protection against defamation. In democratic lands, rabble rousers often take cover under the constitutional right of freedom of speech to abuse that freedom, to dishonor, to vilify and to threaten the well-being of racial and religi-

ous minorities. Some aim their poison arrows against the Papacy, others against Freemasonry, and still others against the Jews.

In the absence of effective legal standards against group defamation, we can only expose to the light of day the dark designs and falsehoods of the sowers of discord. As ever "vigilance is the price of liberty." Guarding our own freedom and well-being we are preserving the liberty and welfare of all. For the canker of prejudice cannot affect one part of the community without affecting the rest.

We do not flatter ourselves with the hope of reaching the agents of malice by appeals to reason. We may as well endeavor to affect the raging storm by argumentation. Victims of blind enmity or conscienceless racketeers, they are beyond moral considerations. Our reply to their charges is intended not for them but rather for the open minded readers who may be duped by their distortions of facts and by their vilifications. Let those who have hearts for truth and good will listen.

I. The Key to the Mystery

"The Key to the Mystery," we are informed, "is the result of a long and serious work by the Research Committee" of the Montreal Women's Anti-Communist League. Acknowledgement is made to the Fascist "Le Parti National Social Chretien" of Montreal and to "The Canadian Nationalist Party" of Winnipeg for the "valuable documents" contained therein. "The Britons," too, receive credit for their material. Nothing is said about the inspiration and aid of the Nazis in bringing out this publication. Perhaps such recognition would have been superfluous. The material speaks for itself. It is very much akin to the stuff that is passed out from Munich, Berlin, Erfurt, and Nuremberg as "racial science."

The "Research Committee" prides itself on its discovery of "the key to the mystery" of "wars, revolutions, acute crises, waves of unemployment, gigantic ruins, terrible upheavals, political turmoils, social strikes, fear and anguish, depressions without precedent," and other evils. That "key" is—the Jew! Wherever there is trouble or calamity, look for the Jew! And if you do not find him, invent him! He has been useful to governments in averting the wrath of the masses from themselves. He has been a convenient scapegoat to carry the blame for popular indignation against economic distress and the sins of the ruling classes, etc.

It may be hoped that the astounding discoveries of the "Research Committee" will spur it on to search for the "key" to still further mysteries, e.g. of measles, chicken pox, small pox, the common cold, influenza, pneumonia, whooping cough, etc. But the key may have been found already. To these physical as to the social and economic afflictions the argument of the Research Committee applies:

> "Where from do such evils come? From the English? The French? The Italians? The Americans? The Poles? The Arabs? The Eskimoes? No!"

By the simple process of elimination the crafty Jew is discovered.

That is not all. There have been crop failures in Germany;

storms have raged in Italy; Mt. Vesuvius erupted; the typhoon wreaked havoc in Japan. Does not the multiplicity of these evils point to the guilt of some culprit? "Where from do such evils come? From the English? The French?" etc. etc. It is as clear as daylight that the Jew is responsible. With its interest in anti-Communism the "Research Committee" should have no difficulty in establishing the claim. For was there not a commission of Soviet scientists studying metereological conditions in the North Pole? Is it not logical, then, to infer that some of them were Jewish? This "proves" that Jewish Communists were manipulating the weather to the detriment of Aryan nations.

The least bit more of investigating and the "Research Committee" may discover the Ten Commandments and read there: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Without straining, the text clearly covers Jewish neighbors as well. But, then, the Decalogue is another creation of the eternal Jew, which he conspired to impose upon a heathen world, and which must not be taken seriously or it may put an end to this business of "researching" and spreading defamatory pamphlets against neighbors.

With what the ""Research Committee" may consider as a stroke of genius it dragged together into thirty-two half-size newspaper pages an interminable amount of material from antisemitic and from other sources. In evident self-satisfaction, it declares:

> "If there is any antisemitic taint in the present publication, Jews can only accuse their leaders and their writers."

How ingenious! The "Research Committee" thinks that it discovered the gentle act of damning a people by means of the utterances of some of its own sons. The enemies of Catholicism have long used the trick of letting ex-Catholic priests or renegade Jesuit monks speak for them. Jew baiters have been past masters in the art. They seek out words of Jewish renegades or present statements of loyal Jews in a way that is calculated to damage Jewish honor. They adroitly wrench statements out of their context, twist their character through sly omissions or additions, and mask falsehood as truth. Lies and half lies are placed by the side of distorted facts. The present publication presents an assortment of passages from the works of fiction, pathological ravings of antisemitic paranoiacs and victims of persecution complexes, fraudulent publications defa-

mations by renegades and ravings of drunkards. Some are derived from avowed Communists and others from Zionists, some from religious men and others from atheists. But the gentle "researchers" show no discrimination. In their "broadness" and generosity, they treat all statements as one voice of Israel damning itself with antisemitic charges.

Cherchez les Juifs

The "researchers" display cleverness as detectives. Certain forces are at work, seeking to dominate the world. Nazism and Fascism operate on an international scale no less than Communism. They send their spies and emissaries to the most distant parts of the world, fomenting strife among peaceful elements in each land and preparing for the overthrow of existing governments, in favor of their particular brands. Lying is turned into a fine art. In Canada as in the United States they maintain agencies whose sole purpose is to spread their poisonous propaganda and seek to undermine the democratic foundations of the state. In their home countries they have built up vast air armadas and colossal armies and navies wherewith they bully their neighbors. Their threat to the British Commonwealth of nations, including Canada, to France and to other freedom loving peoples gives no rest to responsible statesmen.

Their designs are quite clear. Hitler's "Political Testament" to the German nation is stated with terrifying frankness in "Mein Kampf":

> "Never allow two continental Powers in Europe to arise. Look upon every attempt to organize a second military Power on the frontiers of Germany—even though it be only in the form of a State susceptible of military development—as an attack upon Germany, and think it not alone a right but a duty to prevent such a State from arising, or to smash it if it has arisen, by every means, including armed force."

"The day of reckoning with France" is the goal of Nazi foreign policy.

> "Every power," Hitler writes, "is our ally which finds French domination of the Continent insupportable. No road to such a Power must seem too difficult for us and no sacrifice too great if it only provides the final result of the possibility of overthrowing our grimmest hater, France."

Further on he continues:

"We must take up an active policy and throw ourselves into a final and decisive fight with France, with the greatest of German aims at stake. Only then will the eternal and fruitful struggle between us and France be brought to a conclusion; on condition that the annihilation of France be looked upon solely as a means of gaining finally the possibility of expansion for our people." (See Germany's Foreign Policy as stated in "Mein Kampf" by Adolf Hitler, "Friends of Europe" Publications, No. 38, pp. 18-19.) German youth is taught to sing: "Jetzt gehoert uns Deutschland Und bald die ganze Welt." (Germany belongs to us now, and soon the whole world).

Nazi Germany's yearning for colonies and deep affection for the Ukraine have been proclaimed to the whole world by the Fuehrer himself. His absorption of Austria and the Sudetenland and his enslavement of Czecho-Slovakia and grabbing of Memel have shocked the world. Fascist Italy has demonstrated her ambitions in Ethiopia, in Albania, and has shown her hand in Spain. A "pirate" nation let loose her submarines against the world's shipping in the Mediterranean, and its bombers rained death upon defenseless cities and villages. Brute force has been enthroned as the final arbiter of right. The mighty empires of Britain and France are threatened by the Rome-Berlin axis, and all the weaker nations and terrorized.

Within the Nazi and Fascist lands weak minorities are crushed and degraded, and justice prostituted to the vilest ends. Millions are groaning under the tyrant's heel. Personal liberty, culture and moral values are trampled under foot. Brutality is enthroned. Mars marshalls his legions. Organized labor is in chains. Industry is harnessed to the deadly engines of war. Soldiers are on the march. Propaganda mills grind furiously their diabolical lies in order to enslave the masses and to prepare their minds for war. The skies are covered with ominous clouds, portending the total eclipse of human civilization. Peace, liberalism and democracy are derided. The lights of reason and of faith are being extinguished and the hideous fires of hatred against neighboring nations, of social antipathy and of religious bigotry and persecution are kept burning. Brute nationalism and imperialism head the world for destruction. Not only in Europe but also in the Far East, Japan, the third partner of the infernal axis, disregarding all feeling of humanity,

and repudiating treaty obligations and pacts, defiantly declares her "heaven decreed destiny" of expansion and pursues her "national mission to bring order into China" by burning her cities and slaughtering millions of her people.

Daily news from Central Europe, the Mediterranean and the Far East seem to show who are the aggressor nations and who strive for world domination. But the gentle "researchers" refuse to be fooled by appearances. *Cherchez les Juifs!* It is not Nazism, Fascism or Japanese imperialism but Judaism that threatens the world! There is "a Jewish plan of world domination"—is their theme song.

That this plan, embodied in the notorious Protocols of the Elders of Zion has been exposed as a rank forgery, does not deter the feminine zeal of the "Research Committee." If it were at all interested in the truth of the matter it would have found the exposure of the fraud in Philip Graves' "The truth about the Protocols of the Elders of Zion—A Literary Forgery." (first published in the Times of London on Aug. 16th, 17th and 18th, 1921); in Herman Bernstein's "History of a Lie" (1921) or in B. Segel's German work "Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion" (1924, extant also in English translation). These lying Protocols together with their amplification by Theodor Fritsch and Alfred Rosenberg (the "philosopher" laureate of Nazism) had their day in court at Berne, Switzerland (May, 1935). The evidence of experts demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Protocols are the fabrication of the Russian Ochrana (secret police) in the interests of decaying Czarism. Despite the energetic defense of the Protocols by the Nazi expert, Lieutenant-Colonel Fleischhauer, the court recognized their fraudulent character. The president of the court expressed himself in these words:

> "Mr. Fleischhauer has brought a great number of quotations in order to furnish proof for the presence of the Jewish spirit in the 'Protocols.' I indeed have great respect for the industry and working power of Mr. Fleischhauer; but, Mr. Fleischhauer, I am forced to pity you. Your method seems to consist entirely in consulting all sorts of books for and against the Jews and *utilizing only those portions which are unfavorable to the Jews.* I expressly state that one can indeed prove everything by quotations

as well as by statistics. *I state that proof, as far as the genuineness of the 'Protocols' is concerned, has not been furnished."* The Judge concluded: *"I deem the 'Protocols' to be a forgery, a plagiarism and silly nonsense."*

The Nazis use the Protocols as a smoke screen behind which they are carrying out their designs of world domination by force. The antisemites of all lands act as their allies. The renewed publications of the Protocols by antisemitic organizations in America further demonstrates their total disregard for truth.

The "Research Committee" is exercised about imaginary Jewish hostility to Catholicism. If it is truly looking for the enemies of the Church it is wasting its efforts on the Jews. It should rather turn to the propaganda stunt trials of Catholic monks in Nazi Germany aiming to discredit the Church in the eyes of the public, to the anti-Church measures, to the defamatory speeches of Hitler and Goebbels, and to the continuous pressure of the totalitarian regimes —Nazi, Fascist and Communist—upon the Church, to enslave it and to compel the citizens to give unto Caesar the devotion due only to God. We cite the pastoral letter of the Catholic Bishop of Berlin as typical. The Bishop charges the Nazis with a determined campaign against the Church.

> "The offensive against the Church," he writes, "is being carried through step by step but nevertheless systematically in order that its purpose, de-Christianization of our life, may not be recognized too soon." (New York Times, Oct. 11, 1937).

The late Pope Pius XI energetically protested against religious persecution in Germany.

> "For some time," he said, "people have been saying and trying to make other people believe there is no persecution, but all know there is—and very grave persecution. Indeed rarely has there been persecution so grave, so terrible, so painful, so sad in its deep effects. It is a persecution that lacks neither the brutality of violence nor the pressure of threats nor the deceits of cunning and falsehood." (New York Times, Dec. 25, 1937).

If, then, the "Research Committee" is in earnest with regard to the honor and welfare of Catholicism it should be attacking its real enemies, the Nazis instead of slandering their Jewish victims, who have nothing but cordial regards for the Catholic church.

Mystery Revealed

With utter unconcern regarding the truth of the matter, the "Research Committee" continues to spread the libelous forgeries. Its thesis is that Jews seek world domination and does not hesitate to use any argument to substantiate the claim. Indeed, the claim is advanced that the Jews already rule the world. The "Research Committee" has discovered it. Hear and be astounded!

> "If Jewry controls world economic affairs through its control of gold, if it controls the proletariat through its control of three Internationales, it also controls great numbers of politicians and business men through Freemasonry."

To begin with the last point first. The Jewishness of Freemasonry is proved to the hilt. The Papacy is quoted as having called Freemasonry "the Synagogue of Satan." The Masons, indeed, refer to God as the "Grand Architect," i.e., "a *unipersonal* God as that of the Jews, in contradistinction to the *tripersonal* God of Christianity." The Jews themselves admit that Freemasonry is based on Judaism. A Jewish paper openly admitted that

> "Masonry is based on Judaism. Eliminate the teachings of Judaism from the Masonic rule and what is left?"

What a damaging admission! A little more "researching" and it may be discovered that Christianity itself is based on Judaism. Indeed, the Nazis have already discovered this fact and have waged war on both Catholicism and Protestantism as forms of Judaism and hence unworthy of "the heroic Aryan race."

The "Research Committee" has discovered further that these crafty Jews have entered into a conspiracy with the Masons and have organized the League of Nations. The League binds the nations to "collective security." Collective security endangered Italy when it was imperilled by "Ethiopian aggression," and came near to plunging "completely unprepared England into a fatal conflict." The "Berliner *Tageblatt*" is authority for the report that

> "at the admission of Germany to the League of Nations, Stresseman employed Masonic phraseology in his first speech, and actually gave certain signs which were replied to by Briand."

Stresseman, it will be remembered, was a liberal and the "*Berliner Tageblatt*" in pre-Hitler days was owned by a Jew. Do not these considerations fully establish a Judaeo-Masonic conspiracy?

You say: this is rank nonsense! Quite so. But to the "Research Committee" this is mystery revealed. It is of a piece with the other revelations about the Jews controlling all finance ("besides whom the Fords, the Carnegies, the Mellons, the Rockefellers look like dwarfs!") while some of them are busy destroying it by means of organizing communistic revolutions. In fact a Jewish banker, under the influence of liquor, "admitted" it. Indeed, it was not an ordinary banker but a "great New York Jewish banker in a Buda-Pest Cafe, just after the Jew Bela-Kuhn drenched Hungary in Christian blood." The name of the "banker who prepared the Bolshevist Revolution" is not given, but his ravings fill up more than three columns. This is what he has to say about the strange alliance between "high finance" and Bolshevism.

> "Marxism, you say, is the bitterest opponent of Capitalism, which is sacred to us. For the simple reason that they are opposite poles, they deliver over to us the two poles of the earth and permit us to be its axis. These two opposites, Bolshevism and ourselves, find ourselves identified in the Internationale."

The "Research Committee" evidently acts implicitly upon Hitler's rule of propaganda that the more monstrous a lie, the more quickly it will be credited by the ignorant and gullible. Der Fuehrer declares:

> "The vast masses of a nation are in the depths of their hearts more easily deceived than they are consciously and intentionally bad. The primitive simplicity of their minds renders them a more easy prey to a big lie than a small one, for they themselves often tell little lies but should be ashamed to tell big ones. Such a form of lying would never enter their minds. They would never credit to others the possibility of such great impudence as the complete reversal of facts by others. Even explanations would long leave them in doubt and hesitation and any trifling reason would dispose them to accept a thing as true. Something therefore always remains and sticks from the most impudent lies, a fact which all bodies and individuals concerned, *in the art of lying* in this world would know only too well, and hence they stop at nothing to achieve this end." (Germany's Foreign Policy, as stated in *Mein Kampf* by Adolf Hitler, p. 11.)

Plying this "art of lying," the names of the Insull brothers and of Stavisky are added to the list of Jewish exploiters. In the days of their prosperity and power these men held honored places in Christian society. Since their fall from grace antisemites have

thrown them to the Jews. Similarly, Nicholas Lenin has been Judaized. The proof is furnished in a

> " 'Note by reprinter: Lenin studied with *Jewish Zionist students* in Switzerland. English correspondent in Russia, Victor Marsden, referred to Lenin as a "Calmyc Jew,' married to a Jewess, whose children spoke Yiddish.' Herbert Fitch, a Scotland Yard detective who spied upon Lenin as a waiter, said he was a 'typical Jew'."

This is information of which biographers of Lenin are sadly ignorant! Not only Lenin but Kerensky, "who brought about the first Russian Revolution of 1917" is added to Jewish ranks. Evidently the "Research Committee" does not know that Kerensky was a democrat or it would not have sacrified him to the Jews. So excellent a Christian scholar as Prof. Reinhold Niebhur, of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, is turned into a Jew because of a friendly reference of his to Marxism. Generally, it is the assassins of Lincoln, Huey P. Long, etc. and revolutionaries that are thrown into the Jewish camp.

Jews, we are told, control world finance "as a means to power." But who profits by Communism? The answer is not far to seek. Since the U.S.S.R. suppresses antisemitism, the beneficiaries of the Soviet regime are the Jews. It is an illuminating commentary on the "morality" of these antisemites that a policy of simple justice to its Jewish citizens on the part of a government should be regarded with alarm, and that the conscientious fulfilment of their obligations to their government by the Jews should be denounced as discreditable. Russian Jews and Christians alike, no matter how they may be dissatisfied with the political and economic policies of their government, owe it obedience in matters civil and temporal. Only in matters religious can they reserve their right to dissent from the encroachments of the government. As citizens of Russia, Jews and Christians alike give it their loyalty. And those who are educationally equipped naturally fit themselves for government as for other forms of service. Among them a considerable number are Jews. But that as predominantly middle class tradesmen, the Jews were ground to dust by the wheels of the Bolshevist Revolution does not concern the "Research Committee." Nor is it perturbed by the fact that religious Jews suffer no less than Christians under the

atheistic pressure of the Communistic party. For had it searched for the truth it would have found the following testimony in *Germania* (January 5, 1932), the official Catholic newspaper in Germany:

> "We wish to state with all possible emphasis that after thorough investigation we have arrived at the conclusion that all stories about a preferential treatment of the Jews in Russia are either the product of abysmal ignorance or of malicious spreading of false information." ("The Jews in Nazi Germany," The American Jewish Committee, 1935, p. 26.)

The "Research Committee" follows the futile efforts of the antisemites in Germany and elsewhere to identify the Jews with Communism in the hope of thereby discrediting both of them. "Jewish Bolshevism" is the favorite epithet of the Fuehrer. The stubborn fact remains that the Jews number 1.8 per cent of the Russian population and but a fraction of the Communistic party. In 1918, for example, the Communist Party had 124,021 members in Petrograd (now Leningrad). Of these, 74.3% were Russian Slavs, 10.5% Latvians, 6.3% Poles, 3.7% Esthonians, 2.6% Lithuanians, 2.6% Jews. In 1924 they constituted 3.5% of the entire Communist Party of Russia—49,627 members. (Ibid., and Hugo Valentin, *Antisemitism,* 1936, p. 260.) The number of Jews in the Communist parties in other lands has been negligible. The essentially democratic spirit of Judaism is hardly hospitable to the suppression of individual liberty under either Communism or Fascism.

No measure seems to be too indecent to be used in the effort to besmirch the honor of the Jew. Even the medieval Ritual Blood libel is utilized, despite the fact that its falsehood has been exposed times without end in courts of justice of many lands and denounced by the highest dignitaries of the Catholic and Protestant Churches and by scholars and statesmen of all shades of religious belief. Had the "Research Committee" entertained the least regard for truth, it would have found in the book of the Protestant theologian Professor Hermann Strack of the University of Berlin, "The Jew and Human Sacrifice," sufficient material to be forever ashamed of having borne false witness against an innocent people.

II. The Code of the Jew

It is upon the code of the Jew that the "Research Committee" masses its attacks. "All the horrors exposed in preceding pages," it declares, are explicable in the light of the "fatal education which perpetuates a unique and dangerous mentality in the midst of all nations." Here the cloak of religious tolerance is cast off, and bigotry appears in all its hideousness. The quotations marked "contributed by 'The Britons,' London, England," constitute the old stock-in-trade of antisemitism. They were taken not from Jewish sources but from distortions of Jewish teachings in the reproductions of Eisenmenger by his more recent disciples, like Rohling, "Justus" (alias Ahren Briman), Dinter, Dr. Ecker and Theodor Frisch. They have figured in recent Nazi attacks on Jews and Judaism. The "truths" which they contain belong with the "truths" of demonology, witchcraft, black magic, the evil eye, etc. Like counterfeit coins they are set in circulation and often defraud well intentioned people.

A pamphlet entitled "Thus Spoke the Talmud," published by the "Twentieth Century Crusaders" (authorship as well as date and place of publication not given) frankly acknowledges its indebtedness to a Nazi tract by E. Alfken of Dresden, Germany, which is based on "the following authorities of the Talmud." Eisenmenger, Rohling and Ecker.

Before we proceed with the analysis of the rubbish contained in these publications a few words may be said about these "authorities" of the Talmud.

Eisenmenger's work "Entdecktes Judentum (1700, 2 vols.) is characterized by Siegfried (Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, art. Eisenmenger): "Taken as a whole, it is a collection of scandals. Some passages are misinterpreted; others are insinuations based on onesided inferences; and even if this were not the case, a work which has for its object the presentation of the dark side of Jewish literature cannot give us a proper understanding of Judaism"

(Reproduced in Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. V, pp. 81-2, art. Eisenmenger). Prof. Strack writes: "Eisenmenger's polemic answered to the uncouth manner of an earlier period; we are apt to designate it as spiteful; we must also concede that repeatedly his translations are erroneous." (Introduction to the Talmud, pp. 87-88.)

Rohling's "Der Talmudjude" (1871) is of an even lower calibre. Professor Strack refers to it as "a piece of plagiarism from Eisenmenger's work, spiteful and mendacious" (Ibid., p. 282). He publicly charged Rohling of "perjury and gross forgeries" as well as of "disgraceful ignorance" of Judaism. In a court trial instituted by Rohling against Strack the suit was dismissed. (See introduction to 4th ed. of "The Jew and Human Sacrifice.")

Aaron Briman, alias, "Dr. Justus," who supplied Rohling with some material, was converted from Judaism to Protestantism and subsequently to Catholicism. In 1885 he was sentenced by a Vienna court to a long jail sentence and expulsion from Austria for forgery of documents. His work was characterized by Professor Franz Delitszch as "a concoction of damnable lies."

Dr. Ecker, the last named "authority" of the Talmud edited the forgeries of Justus-Briman as his own book. The Catholic Professor Bickel called this fabrication "a fraud of a half-educated pirate." (See The Jews in Nazi Germany, 1935, p. 27.)

The passages bear just enough resemblance to the original to mislead the unsuspecting. Even learned men show themselves gullible in fields outside their specialties. These misquotations are still being spread despite the fact that they have been discredited by Christian German scholars of distinction like Prof. Theodor Noeldeke and Prof. August Wuensche as sworn experts in the libel suit of Rohling v. Bloch in the Law Court of Vienna (1885). Their expert testimony was reproduced by J. S. Block in his book on "Israel and the Nations" (Berlin-Vienna, 1927). Much of the material was exposed by the outstanding Protestant theologians Prof. Franz Delitzsch of the University of Leipzig and Prof. Hermann Strack of the University of Berlin. It has been refuted in the "Antisemiten-Spiegel" of the *Verein zur Abwehr d. Antisemitismus* (Berlin 1900, 1911), not to mention works written by Jewish scholars. These falsifications of renegades and imposters have been

raised by the Nazis to the dignity of "racial science" (*Rassenwissenschaft*) and employed as a weapon to drive the Jews from the professions and from political and economic activities in the hope of bettering thereby the status of "deserving" Aryans. Antisemites of England and America would like to see the same thing happen in their countries. Though exhibiting a lack of the essentials of decency and morality, they brazenly fulminate against the "horrible moral code of the Talmud, that acquits all kinds of crimes, in order to make easier the strife with foreigners to their own nation!" Men who never saw a Talmud in their lives devote their poison pens against its moral standards. The great German humanist, Johann Reuchlin, wrote in vain that "the Talmud was not composed for every blackguard to trample upon with his unwashed feet and say, he too, knew it."

JEWISH SECRETS

The favorite charge of antisemitism is that Jews form a "secret society with clandestine principles and purposes" (Fritsch). Prof. Hermann L. Strack's "*Juedische Geheimgesetze*" (Berlin, 1921) sufficiently explodes this bugaboo of "secret Jewish laws." Another book by the same Christian scholar, "Introduction to the Talmud" (translated from the German, Philadelphia, 1931) may initiate anyone who desires it into "the secrets of the Talmud." There one may find careful bibliographies of the subjects treated in the Talmud, such as law, medicine, philosophy, ethics, superstition, etc. as well as lists of translations of the Talmud into modern languages. Only recently Canon Danby translated the *Mishnah,* which represents the earliest stratum of the Talmud, into English. (Oxford, 1933.) The Babylonian Talmud (i.e. *Mishnah* and its expository supplement, the *Gemara*) has been extant in a German translation by Lazarus Goldschmidt, and the Palestinian Talmud in a French translation by M. Schwab. A poor English version was prepared many years ago by Rodkinson and a better one is now being published by the Soncino press under the editorship of A. Epstein in England. The textbook of the Kabbala, the Zohar, may likewise be read in German, French and English. The *Shulchan Aruch*, too, may be had in the German translation of Loewe and of J. Dessauer (*Orah Hayyim*, 1869). August Wuensche has translated most of

the Rabbinic *Haggadah* (i.e. the homiletical lore as distinguished from the legal portions or *Halacha*) into German. Prof. Strack published a facsimile edition of the oldest manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud in the possession of the University of Munich. His thorough mastery of Rabbinic literature enabled him to publish in collaboration with Billerbeck, an encyclopedic commentary on the New Testament on the basis of Talmud and Midrash (4. vols.) Mention may be made of the English Christian scholar, Travers Herford, who wrote on "Christianity in the Talmud," "the Pharisees" and a commentary and translation of *Pirke Aboth* ("Sayings of the Fathers"). In this country the late Prof. G. F. Moore of Harvard produced a monumental work on "Judaism" during the first two centuries of the Christian era (2 vols. and a supplementary vol. of notes.) Jewish masters from Zunz, who founded the so-called *Wissenschaft des Judentums* more than a century ago, to the present time have labored with might and main to make Jewish knowledge, in all its phases, available to Jew and Christian alike. The Jewis Encyclopedia (Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1901-5) is an example of these efforts.

The rumor that "a Dr. Pinner was poisoned by the Jews when he began to translate the Talmud" (Thus Spoke the Talmud, p. 16) is pure fiction. Ephraim Moses Pinner published his first and only volume of the Hebrew text and translation of the Talmud (tractate *Berachot*) in 1842. As he died in the ripe old age of 80, in the year 1880, the "poisoning" must have worked very slowly and took effect thirty-eight years later. Far from interfering with his translation a number of rabbis and lay scholars endorsed and recommended it as the opening pages of the volume show.

Under these circumstances the reader can properly estimate the truth of the statement: "It is not astonishing that in the face of such prohibitions the secrets of the Talmud have been so little known to other nations, especially to the Western ones and up to the present day, even the most progressive and citizen-like Jews think the disclosure of the principles of the Talmud a proof of the most outrageous intolerance, and an attack on the Jewish religion." The Talmud is a secret only to those who do not know Hebrew, even as Goethe and Heine must remain mysteries to those who are ignorant of German, or as physics and medicine appear secrets to

the uninstructed. From this standpoint, unfortunately, the Talmud and even the Bible have come to be "mysteries" even to many Jews.

What about the passages in Sanhedrin 59a, which seems to suggest the contrary? We find there the words of Rabbi Johanan that

> "an idolator who studies Torah incurs the guilt of death, for it is said (Dt. XXXIII: 4) 'Moses commanded us a law, an inheritance of the congregation of Jacob.' "

By a play upon the Hebrew word for "inheritance" *morasha* and *meorasa,* "betrothed," Rabbi Johanan maintains that the Torah is betrothed to Israel and hence may not be "wedded" by idolators. He evidently suspected that idolators who study Torah are not in earnest or they would not remain idolators. Experience may have also taught him that some enemies of the Jewish people peruse the Torah only for the sake of fault finding and trouble making. Hence he rules against their study of Torah. However, his view remained a mere personal opion. On the same page his view is challenged with the following statement:

> "Rabbi Meir said: whence do we know that a *goy* (gentile) who studies Torah is like a high-priest? From the verse (Lev. XVIII:5) which says (of the laws) 'which if a *man* do he shall live by them.' It does not say: 'priests, Levites or Israelites,' but 'man.' Thus you learn that a *goy* who busies himself with Torah is like unto a high priest" (i.e. he offers the highest service to God).

If Johanan's view were the prevailing one a large host of gentile scholars and their Jewish teachers would have incurred the death penalty. As it is Jewish history records their accomplishments with pride.

The claim that " it is forbidden to disclose the secrets of the Law" is baseless. The teachings of Judaism are available to anyone who takes the trouble to study them. The supposed quotations from *Libbre David* (and in "Thus Spake the Talmud: *Libbre Deah*) is a fabrication. Though repeated in many antisemitic publications, there is no book by such name. What is meant is probably *Dibre David* by Rabbi David ben Samuel Halevi (published in Dyhenfurth, 1689). Only the inventive mind of an enemy of truth and of humanity could find there on p. 37 (section *Teruma Sheni*) the words:

> "To communicate anything to a goy about our religious regulations would be equal to the killing of all the Jews, for if the

goys knew what we teach about them, they would kill us openly." What the passage does say is something different. It begins with a legend (from Midrash Tanhuma, which is cited in Yalkut Shimoni to Dt. XXXII) that

> "when Moses ascended on high to receive the Torah, the ministering angels desired to slay him. He, therefore, said unto them: "For two things do you want to kill me?" So they let him go. This is like the merchant who was traveling in a dangerous place. When robbers caught him in order to murder him, he pleaded with them: "Do you want to kill me because of the five minas which I possess?" So they released him. When he entered into the city, he began to sell precious stones and pearls. Whereupon the robbers taunted him: "Yesterday you said that you have a mere five minas and now you sell precious stones and pearls!" To this he replied: "When I spoke to you thus I was in danger." So Moses said to the angels. "I have only two things, although he obtained a gift of priceless worth." etc. The author proceeds to say that the two tablets of the Law, which Moses received from God, did not convey the great wealth of unwritten Law that went with it. While the written Law is easily acquired even by children of Esau, the Oral Tradition can be acquired only through painstaking labor, "for it can be studied only by one who loves the Holy One with all his heart, with all his soul and with all his might."

The Oral tradition which supplements Scripture figures, in Jewish thought, as a sort of esoteric doctrine which may be enjoyed only by the initiated. But this applies to Jews as well as non-Jews. The clearest declaration on this point is in the Mishnah, Hagiga, II:1,

> "The Chapter on incest (Lev. XVIII) must not be discussed by as many as three, and of creation (Gen. I) by as many as two, and of the "chariot" (Ezek. I) even by oneself unless he is wise and understanding."

the first because of the delicacy of the subject and the other two because they touch the riddles of creation which may only confuse the ordinary person.

The other quotation from "Libre David 37" like the first is made of whole cloth. The related quotation from "Szaalot-Utszabot. The book of Jore d'a.17" cannot be checked because the reference is not specific enough. What is meant is "Sheelot Uteshubot," which simply means Responsa. As there are hundreds of books composed of Responsa of different Rabbinic authorities, the name

of the particular author must be specified. With Prof. Strack we conclude:

> "There are no secret Jewish writings. Within the whole of Judaism there is neither a writing nor an oral tradition, which is inaccessible to learned Christians. Neither do Jews seek to hide anything from Christians, nor are they able to hide anything from them." (Juedische Geheimgesetze, p. 7.)

The Talmud and the Old Testament

From the outworn polemics of the Church, the antisemites took over a number of arguments against Judaism. First, is the charge that Jews pay more regard to the teaching of the Rabbis and to Rabbinic law than to Scripture. The same charge was made by the Jews against the Church, viz. that it ranks the Gospel above the Law. In either case the indictment carries force only as long as men are ignorant of the relation of Scripture to life. Whether in a religious or civic community the written law derives its vitality not so much from its inherent worth and logic as from the manner in which it is interpreted and executed in the life of the people. Thus the U. S. Constitution depends upon the interpretation given it in the courts of our land. In other words, the final authority in our political life is not the Constitution as it was first drawn up but rather as it has been amended and applied by the lawmakers, jurists and executives. The living tradition thus takes preeminence over the written word. To disregard or violate the court rulings regarding points in the constitution is a serious matter, involving the well-being of the country. In this sense, too, the *Halacha* or Rabbinic law, which grew out of the needs of changing times, has constituted the source of authority for Jewish Orthodoxy to a greater degree than the law of the Pentateuch. To be sure extravagant statements were made about the high place of the Oral as of the Written Law in the cosmic scheme of things. But Christians, who elevated the Word or Logos to cosmic significance (see the prologue to the Gospel of John), have no cause to object.

> "For a just estimate of the Talmud," Prof. H. L. Strack writes: "two requirements may be mentioned: (a) We must know not only the conditions (political and otherwise) and the notions (political and otherwise) under which the Jews lived in Palestine and in Babylonia during the first five Christian centuries,

but also how these conditions and notions came to be. If we thus e.g. observe in the Talmud 'the idea of God Judaized' (and accordingly the life and doings of God determined by the Torah), much of the offensiveness is lost and we can understand how the notion arose if we consider how with the Jews in the times after the Babylonian exile the 'Law' was so highly valued as to relegate to the background everything else.

(b) One must bear in mind that the *Talmud is not a law-book,* not a code, in which every sentence is unconditionally valid. In the *Mishnah* (the basic text of the Talmud) itself diverging opinions are placed in juxtaposition very frequently. And the Gemara (the Commentary on the *Mishnah*) almost throughout takes on the nature of a lecture hall or of a collection of minutes of the discussions in which the Amoraim (expounders of the Mishnah) cleared up that which has been said by the Tannaim (the *rabbis* or scholars cited in the *Mishnah*) . . . Accordingly it is highly preposterous to cause all the utterances of a single rabbi found in the Talmud to stand without further ado as 'teaching of the Talmud,' or to hold Judaism responsible for such utterances. As a rule one should cite, 'Rabbi So and So says,' and in this connection not only indicate the period in which this teacher lived, but also note whether he met with opposition, whether the Halachah (law) is after him."

The non-halachic (non-legal) part of the Talmud is not binding for the Jew. Strack writes:

"Of the Haggada one need accept only what is plausible to the understanding." (Introduction to the Talmud, pp. 88-90).

The Talmud and Christ

From the arsenal of old polemics is derived the scurrilous arguments of "the Jewish hatred for the Christian faith." This is due to "Christ's reforming the primitive, tribal moral ideas of the Old Testament," which "deprived the Jews of their very convenient, double morality." This is not the place to discuss the character and teaching of Jesus from the historical point of view. It is sufficient to observe that Jesus would have been the first to resent such reference to the Hebrew Bible, which served as the source of all that was best in his teaching. To the young ruler who asked him what to do that he may acquire eternal life, Jesus recommended the observance of the Ten Commandments (Matt. XIX:16-22; Mark X: 17-22; Luke XVIII: 18-23). When asked to name the

greatest commandment, he pointed to the following Old Testament verses: Deut. VI:4-5 and Lev. XIX:18.

> "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind (might)," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." He added: "On these two commandments hangeth the whole law, and the prophets." (Matt. XXII:35-40; Mark XII:28-34. In Luke X:27 the Jewish lawyer combines the love of God with that of man.)

For Jesus evidently the morality of the Old Testament was not something primitive and tribal. Furthermore practically every statement of the Sermon on the Mount may be paralleled by Jewish teachings as contained in the Hebrew Bible (the Old Testament) Apocrypha (e.g. Testament of Twelve Patriarchs) and contemporary Rabbinic teaching. These sources and parallels have been collected by Prof. Strack in the commentary to which reference was made above. A compendium of Rabbinic ethics is extant in the Mishnaic tractate, "Sayings of the Fathers," and may be read in the English translations of the Christian scholars Taylor, Herford and Oesterley. The work is included in the "Authorized Daily Prayer Book" of Simeon Singer, which is used by a large part of the English speaking Orthodox and Conservative Jews of England and America. A somewhat abbreviated edition of the "Sayings of the Fathers" is presented in the Union Prayerbook, which is used by most of the Reform Jewish Synagogues of the United States and Canada.

An examination of this material will dispel the notion that Jesus came "to deprive the Jews of their very convenient double morality." While Jesus dissented from the Pharisaic masters with regard to certain rules of ceremonial purity, Sabbath observance, etc., he shared their faith and morals. He was not only a Jew by descent but also *a conforming Jew to the point of observing the requirements of the sacrificial cult and other ceremonies as set forth in the Pentateuch and as interpreted by early tradition.* The chief novel element in his life work consisted in his claim to have been the long awaited Messiah. From this belief the Jews have dissented. While suffering, in consequence, strong opposition and even persecution, they generally have exercised wise restraint

toward the dominant faith. And wherever they have met with true Christian faith and practice, they have reciprocated with understanding and respect. With their long record of loyalty to their own religion, the Jews know how to esteem every other religion that directs the human heart to God, and honors every honest endeavor to translate its moral and spiritual truths into righteous conduct.

"The Jewish God"

We are informed further that:

> "According to the Talmud, the Jewish God is not the father of all men and the ideal of love, justice and mercy, like the Christian God; on contrary, he is a God of vengeance down to the tenth generation, just and merciful to his own people."

The charge that Judaism upholds the idea of an angry deity is here ascribed to the Talmud. Antisemites generally impute it to the Old Testament as well. The opinion of the Protestant Professor B. Weiss of Berlin, is, therefore, instructive. In the March number of the *Deutsche Review* (1917) he wrote:

> "The belief is wide-spread that Jesus, on the strength of his peculiar religious consciousness taught the conception of God as a loving Father, in contrast to the wrathful God worshipped in the religion of Israel. But this question is based on the absolutely one-sided conception of the Old Testament which formed the basis of the religion of Israel. This nation has praised the love and grace of its God in such sacred tones that we (the evangelical Christians) cannot, to the present day, find in our liturgies and songs a richer expression of them than the words of the Psalms and Prophets. Others take it that the centre of the doctrine of Jesus is a new moral duty. But Jesus put his fundamental demand of the love of God and of one's fellow man into the garb of Old Testament words; and if, as specifically new in his moral demands, the love of the enemy is pointed to, then it has been forgotten in what touching examples the Old Testament has presented this, and in what golden proverbs it has impressed it. According to the doubtless genuine tradition, Jesus did not come forward with a new moral demand." (Cited by Joseph S. Bloch, Israel and the Nations, p. 431.)

A fitting reply to the charge that "the Jewish God" is wrathful was made by another distinguished German Protestant scholar, Professor Carl Heinrich Cornill:

"Those that are so stirred up over the wrathful God of the Jews either do not know, or forget, that the divine wrath is not only a Jewish but also a Christian doctrine, so that all the stripes and kicks bestowed upon the Old Testament on this account fall equally upon the New Testament." He further observed: "Genuine religious wrath, is one of the divinest passions of which man is capable, for it is the primal revolt of the divinity in man against all that is low and mean, because in this it perceives the degradation and desecration of his true nature . . . The wrath of God is nothing else than the reaction of the divine holiness against all that is unholy and ungodly. For, as a passage of the Psalms has it; 'Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness; the evil shall not sojourn with Thee.' (Psalm V:4) A God lacking in this trait would be like a man lacking in conscience." (The Culture of Ancient Israel, p. 146ff).

The Talmudic teachings regarding God follow those of the Old Testament. The ethical element predominates in both. God is ever presented as father and as king, ruling the world through law and love.

"Like as a father hath compassion upon his children, so hath the Lord compassion upon them that fear him" (Psalm CIII:13)

expressed the Jewish idea of God. Though He is invoked as the God of Israel, He is recognized as the father of all mankind. Antisemites seek to divide non-Jews from Jews and to establish artificial racial barriers between men. Jews, no matter how deeply they resent the venomous hostility of their detractors, have never organized "anti-Aryan" or "anti-Christian" movements. Their supposed hatred of non-Jews exists only in the imaginations of the antisemites. They pray for the union of all men as brothers under God as their common father.

"Have we not all one father?" demanded a Jewish prophet, "Hath not one God created us? Why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, profaning the covenant of our fathers?" (Malachi, II:10).

The Choice of Israel

The doctrine of the choice of Israel has been the pet aversion of bigots. It has been persistently misrepresented as an expression of Jewish vain-glory and pride and of "enjoying a privileged position as masters of the world." Any one familiar with the Bible

knows that the *choice of Israel is purely for the service of God.* It is grounded in the belief that the revelation of God's will to humanity requires prophets and a prophet people as instruments for its transmission. Because of its choice for Divine service the people of Israel is charged with special moral and spiritual tasks. In the words of Amos III:2—

> "Only you have I singled out from all the families of the earth; therefore shall I visit upon you all your iniquities."

Hence the prophets subjected Israel to the severest criticism for failing to exemplify the highest ideal of religion. In this light, the statement that "the Jewish nation is the only nation selected by God, while all the remaining ones are contemptible and hateful" appears as an expression of malice. All people are God's children.

Laws Against Idolatry

The harsh law of Deut. VII:2 applied only to Israel's dealings with the ancient Canaanites. It grew out of the struggle of the people of Israel to gain a foothold in the land which they believed to have been promised them by God. Its severity was to serve as a measure of repression of the spread of idolatry, as the subsequent verses show. (See also Ex. XXIII:32; XXXIV:12-16; Deut. XIII) That these laws were hardly ever executed is shown by the fact that the Israelites themselves often took up idolatrous worship, as the denunciations of the prophets indicate. Even though they were merely "theoretical," they breathe the spirit which is usual in war and which has not yet disappeared from the life of modern nations, which consider themselves as living under a "higher law of love." The loss of political independence in 70 C.E. deprived the Jew of the power of ever applying these laws in their dealings with their neighbors. Though they were carried over into the Talmud and Codes (as every ordinance of Scripture was taken over) they remained archaic survivals of a dead past and nothing more.

These laws, it will be remembered, were taken over also by the Church and made the basis for its dealings with infidels and heathens. What was harsh theory in the Old Testament was turned into tragic reality by the aggressive policy of the militant Church, as shown by the Crusades, the Inquisition and various sectarian feuds. Furthermore, the political history of European nations has

no purer record to show. The brutal treatment accorded by the Communists of Russia to their political opponents and by the Nazis of Germany and Fascists of Italy to their dissenters makes the old ordinance regarding the treatment of heathens look like child's play. Considering further the savage hatred of modern nations and their refinements of the art of mass murder and violence, we might do well by refraining from throwing stones at the ancients.

The law concerning infidels in the Hoshen Mishpat 425:5 is incorrectly translated. It does not read "Those who do not own Torah and the prophets must all be killed," but "Jewish heretics (Epicureans) who either worship idols or transgress the law in spite . . . or who disbelieve the Torah and Prophecy of Israel should be killed. If possible they should be executed publicly with the sword, but if not let resort be made to artifices whereby to bring about their destruction . . ." Noeldke and Wuensche observe:

> "That apostasy is a capital crime is, to be sure, a barbaric view, but it is not peculiar to Judaism exclusively. Islam adhered to it at all times, and acted accordingly. The Persian empire, just at the time of the Talmud dealt similarly with those who deviated from the state religion.
>
> We need not point out the practice of the Christian Churches. *Judaism, as it was nowhere a ruling power, confined itself always to harmless theory . . .*
>
> The free-thinkers are on a par with the apostates; if nowadays orthodox Jews were to destroy all the fellow-Jews who in the sense of the old doctrine were taken for free-thinkers there would have to be a terrible massacre. All this has, therefore, no practical meaning . . .
>
> That the informers or "delators" i.e., such Jews as reported to non-Jewish authorities their knowledge of Jewish conditions to the detriment of all their brethren or of single individuals, and incited the aliens against the former were not considered worthy to be spared, will hardly be disapproved of if one considers the position of the Jews in the old times.
>
> We come across such informers of the most repulsive and dangerous kind in much later times . . .
>
> Here, too, it must be observed that there ought to be authentic evidence furnished of informers, who, as such, have actually been killed by Jews." (Quoted from *J. S. Bloch, Israel and the Nations, p. 182.*

III. The Goyim

The antisemites maliciously misrepresent the rigorous Pentateuchal laws against idolatry as still in force among Jews. Even if they were theoretically in force, the Jews have lacked for the past two thousand years the political power to apply them in practice. The ruling of Rabbi Johanan (3rd century), which has guided the Jewish people in their relations to their neighbors, is: "The gentiles outside of Palestine (i.e., the non-Canaanites) are not regarded as worshippers of idols. They but follow the ways of their fathers." (Hulin 13a.)

Contrary to antisemitic misrepresentations, the word "goy" (pluralized *goyim*, not *goys*) does not mean "unclean." Its original meaning is "nation" or "people." In the Bible the word goy is applied to Israel as well as to other nations. Thus Abraham is told (Gen. XII:2): "And I will make of thee a great nation (goy)." See also II Samuel VII:23. In post Biblical literature the word came to mean a member of a people other than Israel, (i.e., a "national"). When used among Jews themselves it designates one who does not know or who disregards the lore and the precepts of his people.

The Hebrew word "goy" is paralleled by the Latin "Gentile." In Roman law, so the Standard Dictionary informs us, it meant a member of a *gens* or clan; and in civil affairs, one not a Roman. Thus the word is now used among Jews for a person of non-Jewish race or faith; among Christians for one who is neither Jew nor Christian, a pagan, heathen; among Mormons for a non-Mormon, opposed to *saint;* in India among the Mohammedans for a non-Mohammedan.

Obviously the word "goy" reflected the attitude of the person who used it. Where Jews received decent human treatment at the hands of their neighbors, the word goy was used in a matter of fact sense without the least trace of disparagement. It was otherwise when Jews were pillaged, murdered and persecuted by

non-Jews. The feeling toward the Romans, for example, was particularly acrimonious after the legions of Titus wasted Palestine and burned the Temple. It was under the psychosis of a defeated and despoiled people that the statement of Berachot 58b was made:

> "He who sees houses of Israel inhabited says: "Blessed be He who established the border of the widow" (reference to Israel) When he sees them destroyed, he says: 'Blessed be the righteous Judge.' When one sees the houses of idolators inhabited, he says: 'The Lord will pluck up the house of the proud' (Proverbs XV:25). He who sees them in their destruction says: 'The Lord of vengeance hath shone forth.' (Ps. XCIV:1)."

On the other hand, Rabbi Moses Rivkes in his authoritative glosses to the Shulhan Aruch (published in 1661) comments about the statement that "A Jew must not cause the death of a goy but neither must he save his life:"

> "Our sages have said this only of the goyim of their time who worshipped stars and planets and did not believe in the Exodus (i.e., that God reveals Himself in history) and in Creation, but these goyim in whose shade we dwell and among whom we are scattered believe in Creation and in the Exodus and in many principles of religion and they address themselves to the Creator of heaven and earth, as the codifiers have written and as Rabbi Moses Isserles quotes in Orah Hayyim, ch. 156 in the gloss: 'Not only is there no prohibition against saving them when in danger, but we are even obligated to pray for their welfare, and as the author of the *Maase Adonai* in the section on the Seder Haggadah (ritual for the eve of the Passover) explains in his note on the verse (Ps. LXXIX:6: 'Pour out Thy wrath upon the nations that know Thee not'). (He writes) that David prayed that God pour out His wrath upon the nations that believe not in Creation and in the miracles and wonders which the Lord wrought unto us in Egypt and in the revelation of the law, but these nations in whose shadow we live and under whose wing we are sheltered believe all these things. And we ever stand on our watch ready to pray at all times for the peace and prosperity of the government and the princes and for all the provinces and places of their dominion. And Maimonides wrote that the law is in accord with the saying of Rabbi Joshua (Sanhedrin 105a) that *the pious of the nations of the world have a share in the world to come.*" (Hoshen Mishpat, 425:5).

The comment from the *Maase Adonai,* which Moses Rivkes quotes, throws light on the quotation from Pranajtis, marked "A prayer found in the Talmud and said on the eve of Passover at the present day":

> "We beg Thee, O Lord, indict Thy wrath on the nations not believing in Thee, and not calling on Thy Name. Let down Thy wrath on them and inflict Thy wrath upon them. Drive them away in Thy wrath and crush them to pieces. Take away, O Lord, all hope for them. In a moment overwhelm all disbelievers. Destroy in a moment all foes of Thy nation."

The author's ignorance of both Bible and Talmud is displayed by his reference. The passage consists of Psalm LXXIX:6-7 (cf. Jeremiah X:25); Ps. LXIX:24 and Lamentations III:66. The translation of these verses in any English Bible should convince any one of the willful distortion and misrepresentation of Pranajtis. We quote from the King James version:

> *Psalm LXXIX:6-7:* Pour out thy wrath upon the heathen that have not known thee, and upon the kingdoms that have not called upon thy name. For they have devoured Jacob, and laid waste his dwelling place.
>
> *Psalm LXIX:24:* Pour out thine indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold of them.
>
> *Lamentations III:66:* Persecute and destroy them in anger from under the heavens of the Lord.

The recitation of these verses on the eve of the Feast of Freedom was prompted by the all too human reaction of an oppressed and persecuted people towards its tormentors. Despite its naturalness, Reform rituals have eliminated these verses from the Seder ritual. The Revised Union Haggadah, for example, substitutes for it Ps. CXVII:

> Praise the Lord, all ye nations;
> Laud Him, all ye peoples.
> For His mercy is great toward us;
> And the truth of the Lord endureth for ever. Hallelujah!

T. K. Cheyene, in his commentary on the "Book of Psalms" calls attention to the fact that Psalm LXXIX was frequently on the lips of the Huguenots, and that "At an earlier age, Dante had been charmed by its *dolce salmodia* (Purg. XXIII:1) "and that long afterwards this Psalm expressed the feelings of Englishmen during

the Indian mutiny. Readers of Milton will recall his sonnet "On the Late Massacre in Piedmont," which reechoes the same sentiment:

> "Avenge, O Lord thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
> Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;
> Ev'n them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
> When all our fathers worship'd stocks and stones.
> Forget not: in thy book record their groans
> Who were thy sheep, and in their ancient fold
> Slain by the bloody Piedmontese that roll'd
> Mother with infant down the rocks . . ."

Ps. LXXIX:6 had for a long time formed part of a penitential prayer which used to be read in Hamburg churches. According to Friedrich Nicolai, when in 1769 two pastors sought to eliminate this verse,

> "Pastor Goeze raised his voice against this, and the public sided with him, wishing, according to tradition, to retain the verse in the prayer. Lessing was of the opinion that the church prayer might be defended; but the matter should be carefully examined in order to ascertain the sense in which this prayer could be used with perfect propriety."

To this end he wrote "a sermon about two texts, on Ps. LXXIX:6 . . . and on Matthew XXII:39 (originally *Lev. XIX:18*)". (See J. S. Bloch, *Israel and the Nations,* pp. 83-84).

Supposed Depreciation of Non-Jews

Baba Mezia 114b: "You are human beings but the nations of the world are not human beings but beasts." This supposed translation is an outright falsification of the original. By its detachment from the context it conveys a sinister idea, wholly alien to Judaism. This section of the Talmud presents a bit of legal casuistry relating to ceremonial purity. The basis for the laws of defilement is furnished by Num. XIX:14, "This is the law; when a *man* (*Adam*) dieth in a tent, every one that cometh into the tent, and everything that is in the tent, shall be unclean seven days." The application of the law was limited to Jews, i.e., the defilement of a tent or dwelling and its contents ensued only when a Jew died but not in case of the death of a non-Jew. Similarly the corpse of a dead Jew was defiling, but not that of a non-Jew. Accordingly, an Aaronide, i.e., a priest of the house of Aaron, was not permitted

to touch the corpse or to step upon the grave of a Jew, but he did not become defiled by contact with the corpse or grave of a non-Jew. This is the subject of the passage in Baba Mezia 114b. Rabbi Simeon ben Johai is quoted there as teaching that

> "the graves of gentiles do not defile, for it is said (Ezek. XXXIX:31): 'And ye My sheep, the sheep of My pasture, are men (*Adam*)'. (That is:) you are called Adam (man) and not the non-Jews."

In other words, from the use of *Adam* in Num. XIX:14 and in Ezek. XXXIV:31, the inference is drawn that the laws of ritual purity apply only to Jews and not to Gentiles. Incidentally, this opinion of Rabbi Simeon ben Johai was rejected by some of his colleagues. Rabbi Simeon ben Gamliel held that the graves of Gentiles defile, i.e., that they are like Jewish graves (Ohalot, XVIII:9).

Nothing is said about non-Jews as being "not human beings but beasts." The contrary is true: *Rabbinic literature ever emphasizes the dignity of all men without distinction of race or creed.* It proceeds from the Biblical view of the common descent of the human race from one pair of ancestors and of the Divine endowment of man. For example, Rabbi Akiba, who was distinguished for his nationalistic zeal, taught:

> "Beloved is *man,* for he was created in the image of God, as it is said (Gen. IX:6: 'For in the image of God made He man'." (Abot III:18.)

The spirit in which the Rabbis spoke of Gentiles may be illustrated by the following passage from the Sifra on Lev. XVIII:5. In what amounts to an elaboration of the words of Rabbi Meir in Sanh. 59a, which we cited above:

> "Rabbi Jeremiah, said: Whence do we know that even a Gentile (goy), who occupies himself with the study of the Torah, is like a high-priest? From the words: 'which if a *man* do he shall live by them.' Likewise it is not stated: 'This is the law of the priests, Levites and Israelites,' but 'This is the law of *man,* O Lord God' (II Sam. VIII:19). It is also said (Isa. XXVI:2): 'Open ye the gates that the *righteous nation* that keepeth faithfulness may enter in.' It does not say 'priests, Levites and Israelites,' but 'that the righteous nation . . . may enter in.' Likewise it is said (Ps. CXVIII:20) 'This is the gate of the Lord; the *righteous* shall enter into it.' It does not say: 'priests, Levites

and Israelites,' but 'the righteous shall enter into it.' Similarly it is said (Ps. CXXV:4): 'Do good, O Lord, unto the *good!*' It does not say 'unto the priests, Levites and Israelites,' but unto the good.' This shows that even a gentile who devotes himself to the Torah is like unto a high priest."

Another Supposed Insult: Tosephta Erubin V:15

The tractate *Erubin* ("Blendings" or "Fusion of Sabbath Limits") deals with the legal fictions whereby the irksome Sabbath Laws may be circumvented. These include the *Erub tehumim,* "blending of boundaries," to enable Jews to walk beyond the 2,000 cubits permitted by rabbinical law (see Mechilta on Ex. XVI:29) and *Erub hazerot,* "blending of courts," to enable them to carry needed objects on the Sabbath from one domain to the other. To this end those who have their residences around one court combine their several domains by depositing in one dwelling food prepared on Friday from joint contributions. When all the residents are Jews all goes well. However, if a heathen or a Jew who does not subscribe to this legal fiction of "blending" (e.g. a Sadducee) he can prevent the operation of the *erub.* In this connection the Tosephta states that the court of a heathen does not count in such "blendings." The passage reads: "The court of an idolator is regarded as a fold of cattle," and therefore cannot prevent the Jewish courts from being joined into one. (Tosephta Erubin V:15). This view is challenged by R. Meir who holds that "the dwelling of an idolator is considered a dwelling," i.e., it is on a par with Jewish dwellings. (Bab. Talmud Erubin 62a.)

Injuring a Goy

Another trumped up charge is made on the basis of a passage from Sanhedrin 57a, which is given incorrectly and rendered unintelligible by detaching it from its context. It does not state that "The son of Noah, who would steal a farthing ought to be put to death, but an Israelite is allowed to do injury to a goy." What it does say requires an elaborate explanation. This passage of Sanhedrin (beginning with 56a) discusses the Noachian laws (based on Gen. VII:1-7) and the penalties attached to their violation. One opinion is that only incest, bloodshed and blasphemy are punishable with death. Another opinion is that idolatry is

PROPERTY OF
ST. JOHN CANTIUS' SEMINARY
Congregation of the Resurrection

punished the same way. Still another view is that all the seven laws are punishable with death. From the standpoint of the last opinion, robbery is punished with death. The question is consequently raised: Is a gentile who is pledged to the observance of the Noachian laws put to death for robbing? Is there not a tradition (see Tos. Aboda Zara VIII:5) which states that "stealing, robbing, capturing a woman in war *and the like* are forbidden a gentile from either a gentile or a Jew, but are permitted a Jew from a gentile?" (The commentator, Rashi, calls attention to the Rabbinic view of B. K. 113a which forbids such things to a Jew on the ground that they dishonour God's name.) "If, then, robbing by a Noachide is punishable with death, why does not the tradition use the word "guilty" (instead of "forbidden")? The answer is that since the end section states: "A Jew from a gentile is permitted," the beginning section uses the corresponding word "forbidden." (Again Rashi adds that the word *"permitted" means that the Jew is free from the death penalty but incurs punishment.*) After a discussion about the words "guilty" and "free" and "forbidden" and "permitted," the Gemara asks: "What is meant by the words "and the like" in connection with robbery (in the above cited tradition)? One of the answers is by Rab Papa that this phrase refers to appropriating less than a *peruta* (farthing). To this the Gemara raises the objection: "If so, why forbid (i.e., under the penalty of death) a goy robbing a Jew? Cannot the Jew pardon him (the small amount)?" The answer is given: "Let us allow that afterwhile the Jew will pardon him, but at the time that he was robbed was he not hurt?" Question: "Then why not say the same with regard to a gentile who robs a gentile? Since they generally do not pardon one another in such matters, the appropriation of less than a farthing constitutes real robbery."

The whole tenor of this discussion indicates that we have here another exercise in legal dialectics. The opinions expressed are those of individual rabbis which meet with direct objection and rebuttal. That they were never applied to life is demonstrated by the fact that for centuries before they were expressed the Romans deprived the Jews of the right to exercise capital punishment, a right which they have nowheres regained in either Christian or Mohammedan lands.

"Extolling Robbery of Gentiles to the Dignity of a Religious Dogma"

The malice in this title requires no comment. It well reflects the mentality of the antisemites. To refute the libel that Jews have no regard for the property of their neighbors amounts to reasserting the fact that the eighth commandment forms part of the Decalogue. The Code of the Covenant, the oldest in the Pentateuch, states: "And the stranger shalt thou not oppress; for ye know the heart of the stranger, seeing you were strangers in the land of Egypt." (Ex. XXIII:9). The Deuteronomic code is distinguished by its emphasis upon consideration for the stranger. Chapter XXIV:17 declares:

> "Thou shalt not pervert the justice due to the stranger."

The clearest statement of the Pentateuch on this point is found in the Holiness Code (Lev. XIX:33-34):

> "And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not do him wrong. The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be as the home-born among you, and *thou shalt love him as thyself,* for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."

Not even in ceremonial observances were exceptions made. For example, regarding the celebration of the Passover, the law states (Ex. XII:47-49):

> "All the congregation of Israel shall keep it. And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the Passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it, and he shall be as one that is born in the land; but no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. *One law shall be to him that is home-born, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you.*"

Obviously, the obligations of the religion of Israel did not devolve upon strangers. They were not expected to observe the laws of ceremonial purity, the requirements of the sacrificial cult, Sabbath observance, etc. According to the Rabbis, the so-called seven Noachian laws of humanity is all that was expected of them. These laws are: observance of civil laws, prohibition of blasphemy, idolatry, bloodshed, robbery and eating a limb of a living animal (Sanhedrin 56a; compare Acts XV:29). An observer of the Noachian laws was called a *ger toshab,* a resident-alien, and had the status of a half proselyte, and was treated on a par with the Jewish people in all, save ceremonial, matters. Christians and

Mohammedans were classed, from the standpoint of Jewish law, as *gere toshab.*

However, even to gentiles who did not follow the Noachian laws the Pentateuchal laws of consideration and justice applied. If, while enjoying political independence, justice to the stranger formed part of religious duty, it became a vital necessity to the Jews after the Fall of Jerusalem (70 C.E.), when they themselves scattered into many lands and became dependent upon others. Thus, Rabbi Akiba taught that it is forbidden to rob a Canaanite (Baba Kama 113a). The Tosephta Baba Kama IX:9 states:

> "Whoever robs a *nochri* (stranger) must make restitution to him. More severe is the robbery of a stranger than that of an Israelite, for if one robs a stranger and takes an oath (denying the need), and the victim dies, he has no atonement, because he has profaned the name of God."

Maimonides states in his Code (Hilchot Gezela Vaabeda II:2):

> "It is forbidden by the Torah to steal the least amount. Even a heathen it is forbidden to rob or oppress; and if one robbed or oppressed him, he must make restitution. When is one considered as robbing? When he takes a person's property by force . . . What constitutes oppression? That is when the property of a person came into his power with the consent of the owner, but when asked to deliver it, he keeps it by force and does not return it. For example, if one owed him money in the form of a loan or of wages, and he cannot collect it from him because he is a hard man. Of this Scripture says (Lev. XIX:13), 'Do not oppress nor rob thy neighbor.' *The words, 'thy neighbor,' are not limited to a fellow-Jew, but includes all men.*"

The statement, "that all property of other nations belongs to the Jewish nation, which consequently is entitled to seize upon it without any scruples," is pure invention.

More Malicious Inventions

No less malicious and false is the next assertion that

> "an Orthodox Jew is not bound to observe principles of morality toward peoples of other tribes, and on certain occasions, on the contrary, he even ought to act against morality, if it were profitable for himself or for the interests of Jews in general."

Such a statement runs counter to the spirit of Judaism. Jewish ethics draws no distinction between Jew and gentile in matters of morality. Rabbi Moses of Coucy, in his *Code Sefer Mizvot Haggadol* (Prohibitions, 2) writes:

"They who lie unto gentiles and cheat them are among those who profane God's Name, for they cause the gentiles to say, 'The Jews have no Torah,' and Scripture cries aloud (Zephaniah III:13). 'The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity, nor speak lies.' "

And R. Eliezer b. Nathan writes, in the same strain:

"With regard to the commandment, 'Thou shalt not steal,' it is as with the commandments, 'Thou shall not murder,' and 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.' The application is the same whether the victim is a Jew or Goy" (Eben Ha-Ezer, 91).

The passage marked "Szulchan Aruch, Choszen Hamishpat, 348" is another misquotation. There is no such law as:

"A Jew may rob a goy, that is, he may cheat him in a bill, if unlikely to be perceived by him; otherwise, the name of God would be dishonored."

The passage in question reads:

(1) "It is forbidden by the Torah to steal even a small amount. It is also forbidden to steal in jest, or even with the intent of restoring the theft or repaying double its amount later on, or in order to grieve the possessor. All that is forbidden, so that one may not accustom himself to stealing." (2) "Whoever steals property of the worth of a *peruta* (farthing) transgresses the Scriptural prohibition of theft, and he is obligated to repay. It is all one whether one steals the property of a Jew or of a gentile, of an adult or a child." (Hoshen Mishpat, 348, Shulchan Aruch; see also Maimonides, *Hilchot Geneba,* 1:1-2).

To the last paragraph, R. Moses Isserles (following Rabbi Jacob ben Asher's *Tur*) writes:

"The error of a gentile, e.g., leading him to error in accounting or to collect thereby a loan which he owes is permitted when not perceived by him, for in such a case there is no profanation of God's Name. And some hold it forbidden to mislead a goy in accounting, but, if he himself erred it is permitted."

In the light of R. Joseph Caro's remark (*Keseph Mishna, H. Gezela Vaabeda* 1:1), the statement that "There is no profanation of God's Name" seems to refer to the practice of *taking advantage in accounting in order to collect a debt* (see B. Kama 113b).

The view expressed by Isserles has not the support of other authorities. Maimonides before him, in the section on Theft, in his *Code,* wrote:

"Whether one deals with a Jew or gentile, if he has short-weighted or short-measured him, he has trangressed a Divine prohibition and he must restore the damage. Similarly, it is

forbidden to mislead a gentile in reckoning. One must be accurate with him as it is said in connection with a Hebrew slave (Lev. XXV:50), 'And he shall reckon (carefully) with his buyer,' even though he is within your power. How much more should one be exact with the gentile who is not under your hand! Taking advantage of another's error comes under the scriptural condemnation, 'for it is an abomination unto the Lord who do all these,' especially who do iniquity" (*Hilchot Geneba* VII:8).

In the section on *Robbery and Loss* (XI:4-5), Maimonides stated:

"The error of a gentile is like his loss (which need not be returned), but only if the error was made by himself. However, it is forbidden to mislead him. Thus when a gentile has erred in his reckoning the Jew must expressly tell him, 'I rely upon your reckoning, and I accept what you tell me.' But if he did not speak thus to him, taking advantage of the error is forbidden."

The glossator of the *Shulhan Aruch,* R. Moses Rivkes, goes beyond Maimonides in condemning such practices and in demanding that Jews should not, under any circumstances, take advantage of the error of a gentile:

"I write this for all generations, for I have seen many grow rich through deceiving of gentiles, but they did not prosper. Their possessions went to destruction and they did not leave any blessing behind them. On the other hand, as the *Sefer Hasidim* (1074) states, 'Many who sanctified God's Name by restoring the errors of the gentiles in worthy matters have grown great and rich and prosperous, and left their gain to their children" (*Hoshen Mishpat* 348:2).

In another gloss, he says:

"For a long time it has been customary for the leaders of the Jewish community to watch that no fraud be perpetuated upon goyim. And it is permitted to publish and announce to the goyim which men (Jews) buy on credit or borrow without intending to repay" (*Ibid.* 386:12).

With regard to returning things lost by gentiles, we read in the Talmud (Baba Kama 115b), "Rabbi Simeon Hasida says: robbing a Canaanite is forbidden, but retaining articles lost by him is permitted." The reason for the latter is probably due to the fact that the Canaanites did not return things lost by Jews. (Roman law did not require the return of lost articles.) Rabbi Pinhas ben Jair says: where there is a profanation of God's Name it is forbidden to keep the lost property of a Canaanite." Judah Hasid (in the 12th century) wrote:

"Be careful not to take advantage of the error of a gentile who observes the Noachian laws, and return his losses to him, and do not disparage him, but honor him more than a Jew who does not conduct himself according to the Torah." (*Sefer Hasidim* 358).

These views are at variance with *Hoshen Mishpat* 266:1, which reads:

"Retaining an object lost by a heathen is permitted . . . and he who returns it is a transgressor for he strengthens the hands of trangressors (i.e., heathens). But if he returns it in order to sanctify the Name of God so that the people of Israel may be praised for their faith, he is praiseworthy. And whenever God's Name is in danger of being dishonored, it is forbidden to retain the lost article and it must be returned."

Regarding the first part of this paragraph, Rabbi Moses Rivkes comments:

"This applies only to heathens but not to nations of the present who believe in God and whose laws order the return of lost property."

The quotation from the Hoshen Mishpat 283:1 is correct:

"Should a goy to whom a Jew owed some money die without his heirs knowing about the debt, the Jew is not bound to pay the debt."

However, it is from a note to this paragraph by Isserles to which Rivkes registers his dissent, saying:

"The Torah has not permitted us the property of gentiles. Such a debt (of which the heirs are ignorant) should be returned to the owners as lost articles are returned."

The passage about testimony from *Hoshen Mishpat* 28:3 is incorrect. It does not read:

"If a goy wants a Jew to stand witness against a Jew at the court of law, and the Jew could give fair evidence, he is forbidden to do it, but if a Jew wants a Jew to be a witness in a similar case against a goy, he may do it."

The correct translation is:

"If a gentile sues a Jew and there is a Jew who has favorable testimony for the gentile, and he is the only witness and the gentile demands that he testify in a place where the gentile laws convict in monetary matters on the testimony of one witness, he is forbidden to testify for him; and if he did testify, he is ex-communicated. However, if in the beginning, the gentile singled out the Jew to witness for him, it is a profanation of God's Name not to testify in the gentile's behalf."

Non-Jewish Property

Antisemites often make use in their literature of another set of misquotations related to the preceding. These quotations are supposed to be from Baba Bathra 54a-55a:

> "The estates of the goys are like wilderness, who first settles in them has a right to them," and, "If a Jew has struck his spade into the ground of the goy, he has become the master of the whole."

And from the *Hoshen Mishpat,* they cite:

> "A property of the goys is like a thing without a master."

What is the truth about these supposed laws? This section of the Talmud discusses the ways and means whereby one gains title to real property, and the difference between the Jewish and the Persian law in this regard. The passage reads:

> "A field marked off by boundaries may be possessed by striking in it one spade. This is the view of Rab. But Samuel holds that thereby one acquires only the spot into which he struck the spade. And how much must one dig in a land that is not marked off by boundaries in order to gain possession? Rab Papa says: by having a yoke of oxen plow a furrow across the entire length of the field and back again. Rab Judah said further, in the name of Samuel, that the *property of a gentile is like deserted property so that whoever takes possession of it is its owner.* (That is, if he sells his field to one Jew and another gets ahead and takes possession, the second is entitled to it on condition that he reimburses the first.) What is the reason? A gentile completes the transaction when he receives payment (and immediately renounces ownership), but the Jew does not acquire possession until he obtains the title-deed. (Hence, the Jewish would-be buyer had not yet validly acquired the land.) Said Abaye to Rab Joseph: Did Samuel teach thus? Did not Samuel lay down the principle *dina d'malchuta dina, 'the civil law of the States is binding upon the Jew?'* And the king ruled that land may not be purchased except through securing a title-deed," etc., etc.

The Shulchan Aruch (Hoshen Mishpat 194:1-2) rules:

> (1) "A gentile does not acquire land by possession (and not by payment), but by the deed of sale which he obtains upon delivering payment, and an Israelite who buys from a gentile is like a gentile and he does not gain possession until he has received the deed of sale."
>
> (2) "Since a gentile does not acquire land from an Israelite or bestow possession upon an Israelite, except by means of a deed of sale, an Israelite who buys a land from a gentile and gives

him money, but before taking title another Israelite comes and takes possession, the latter is entitled to hold it, but he must reimburse the first; for the gentile gives up his right to the land when he receives the money, but the Israelite does not acquire the land until he has secured a written document. Thus this property appears for a while ownerless, like the desert, so that whoever gains possession owns it."

Destroying Churches

The vicious pamphlet, "Thus Spake the Talmud," repeats most of the above-reputed libels. On page 30, it cites the following statement which is supposed to be taken from "Shulchan Aruch, Johre Deah, 143":

"It is a good deed for every Jew to burn and destroy the non-Jewish church or whatever belongs to it or is done for it, and to throw the ashes into the four winds or to throw them into the water. Furthermore, it is the duty of every Jew to try to uproot every non-Jewish church and to give it a coarse name."

Thus speaks not the Talmud, but an antisemite. No such statement or anything remotely approximating it is continued in the passage indicated. The whole statement is the product of an antisemite's inventive imagination. Evidently even the compiler of this collection of distortions and lies felt that an explanation is necessary. He, therefore, adds the following comment:

"How faithfully the above commandment is followed in the twentieth century! In Russia, at least 42,000 priests have been murdered and their churches destroyed. In Spain, some 11,000 priests and nuns were murdered, and over 20,000 churches, chapel and monasteries destroyed, according to Communist reports. COMMUNISM IS JEWISH.

This is a fair example of the hooliganism resorted to by the antisemites. Following the pattern of Nazi propaganda, communism is identified with Judaism, despite the utter falsehood of the charge, and then all the excesses of communism—whether real or imaginary—are blamed upon the Jews. While synagogues were burned and destroyed by the hundreds in antisemitic Germany (November, 1938), it is yet to be shown that a single Church has ever been damaged by Jews.

IV. Annulment of Vows

Not only Jewish beliefs and attitudes toward non-Jews but also Jewish ritual practices form the concern of the antisemites. They are particularly exercised by the "Annulment of Vows" and the Kol Nidre. *Shulhan Aruch, Fore Dea,* 228:1, 3 reads:

> "He who has vowed and repented can rectify matters by a turn of heart; even if he has vowed by the name of the God of Israel. What shall he do? Let him go to a qualified scholar, or in the absence of an expert let him go to three informed laymen who know how to find a loop-hole and let them annul his vow." . . . (3) "What constitutes annulment? He shall be told three times, 'It is released unto you; it is allowed unto you; it is permitted unto you."

This institution is based upon the rashness with which men make vows and pledges and the difficulty with which they carry them out. Thus Dt. XXIII:22 states:

> "When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shall not be slack to pay it; for the Lord thy God will surely require it of thee; and it will be sin in thee. But if thou shalt forbear to vow, it shall be no sin in thee. That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt observe and do; according as thou hast vowed freely unto the Lord thy God, even that which thou hast promised with thy mouth."

The subject of vows is treated in Number XXX. Verse 3 reads:

> "When a man voweth a vow unto the Lord, or sweareth an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word; he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth."

The sage warns (Ecclesiastes V:3-5):

> "When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it, for He hath no pleasure in fools; pay that which thou vowest.
>
> Better is it that thou shouldst not vow than that thou shouldst vow and not pay. Suffer not thy mouth to bring thy flesh into guilt, neither say thou before the messenger, that it was an error; wherefore should God be angry at thy voice, and destroy the work of thy hands?"

The breaking of a vow was believed to bring dire consequences. Hence to check this tendency, the law gave the father the right to

annul the vows of his daughter and to the husband those of his wife (Num. XXX:4-17). The rabbis extended the law of annulment of vows to include the vows of men. On the one hand, they cautioned men against making vows of any kind (see *Yore Dea* 203:1-5). However, in case a vow was made, its annulment could be affected by stating the matter before an expert who was to examine the nature of the oath or pledge and, upon finding that no third party was involved, could pronounce its annulment. The situation was aggravated by the fact that any emphatic statement, such as saying twice, "I shall do a certain thing," or "I shall not do it," amounted to taking an oath (*Yore Dea* 237:4-5). Any promise constituted a vow. Hence, in speaking of future acts, Jews were taught to say: "*Bli neder*—without vowing." Thereby they hoped to escape the punishment consequent upon the non-fulfillment of vows or obligations. Inasmuch as, despite the greatest caution, a person may have overlooked some rash promise, two ceremonies were devised. On the eve of the New Year or of the Day of Atonement each Jew was to recite before a court of three a formula of repentance of all oaths, vows, obligations, etc., which he may have made in the course of the past year. This formula specified:

"I do not ask to be released of obligations from which I cannot be released,"

i.e., *of obligations toward others, but only to oneself and to God* (see Yore Dea 211:4). This formula, together with the response of the court of three, is printed in Orthodox rituals for the High holy-days. It is known as *Hapharat Nedarim*.

Kol Nidre

As some individuals may have been prevented from observing this ceremony, a collective annulment of vows is made before the commencement of the service for the eve of Atonement. The formula for this occasion is known as the Kol Nidre. It seems to have originated in Palestine sometime before the ninth century. In its original form, it aimed to annul the unfulfilled vows and obligations that were made in the course of the past year. This form is still used in some rituals. In German and Russo-Polish as well as American Orthodox congregations, the words of the Kol Nidre refer to the vows that may be made in the course of the year to come. It serves the community in the same way in which the phrase, *bli neder*, "without vowing," serves the individual.

It must be said that upon the first appearance of the formula of Kol Nidre some of the heads of the Babylonian academies attacked it as unworthy of a place in the Jewish service. Rab Amram, who drew up the first complete synagogue ritual, denounced its recitation as a foolish custom, *minhag shtus*. Despite these protests, the custom spread far and wide to commence the Yom Kippur service with the Kol Nidre. (See J. Mann, Texts and Studies, II:51-3.)

The protests against the use of this formula of absolution were prompted by grave concern for the welfare of the Jewish people. Unscrupulous men of elastic consciences used it as a means of escaping their obligations and oaths. Jew-haters, taking advantage of the lapses of individual Jews, accused the whole Jewish people of being untrustworthy. Pointing to the Kol Nidre, they argued that the Jew does not intend to keep his promises, pledges and oaths. On this and similarly flimsy grounds, they succeeded in having the legislators of several countries administer a special oath to Jews, known as *More Judaica.* This insulting oath was abolished in European countries only within comparatively recent times.

In consequence of the fact that the Kol Nidre entered the Synagogue under protest and that grave misunderstandings were caused by it, misunderstandings endangering the welfare of the Jewish people, the Reform rabbis in conference at Brunswick in 1844 resolved unanimously that this formula is not essential to Jewish worship and that for the good of Judaism it should be abolished. In most Reform synagogues, therefore, the inspiring music of the Kol Nidre is retained, but the old formula of absolution of vows is generally replaced with a hymn or prayer expressive of the spirit of the holy day.

The Kol Nidre sprang from a purely spiritual motive. It was never intended to free man of his obligations toward his fellowmen, but rather to absolve him of rash promises that affected his own conscience and his personal relation to God. This sentiment was in harmony with the teaching of the Rabbis that sins committed against God may be atoned through prayer and a turn of heart or repentence on Yom Kippur, but not sins committed against his fellowmen. These cannot be forgiven until the offended parties have been duly appeased (Yoma VIII:9).

Eisenmenger himself, after weighing the charges laid before him by a Jewish renegade against his former correligionists, concludes, "that the Jewish convert lies and that Kol Nidre does not refer to

an oath sworn by one Jew to another, or by a Jew to a goy. It refers only to vows which one takes upon himself, etc." (see *Entdecktes Judentum* II, p. 498, cited by Bloch, op. cit., p. 272). He writes further that the text and introductory formula

> ". . . refer to no other vows or oaths than to those by which a man binds himself of his own will, and swears that he will do or not do this or that; for instance, when a man swears that in the future he will only drink water, and not eat any meat, of which there are many instances in the book, *Shulchan Aruch* (*Yore Deah,* no. 238); with this, the oath which a Jew swears to a Christian or to the Christian magistrate has nothing to do. Therefore, the rabbi, Salman-Zevi, writes the perfect truth in his book, *The Jewish Theriak,* which he addresses to the Jewish cast slough of a snake of Samuel Friedrich Brentzen, of writing against the above mentioned accusation of Brentzen (p. 18, col. 2, and p. 19, col. 1, in the 3rd chapter, no. 9), in the following way:
>
> " 'Here writes the apostate, that we permit each other to perjure ourselves toward a Christian, etc. I affirm here that the apostate is a liar, and that Kol Nidre does not refer to an oath which a Jew swears to another Jew or to a Christian. It refers only to the vows which one takes upon one's self as it is written (Numb. 30.3), 'And her father heard her vow, and her bond wherewith she hath bound her soul'—i.e., herself. If one takes an oath for fasting or something else, the Kol Nidre helps him to have it annuled by an excellent man, i.e., by one who is well versed in the law, or by three righteous men.' "

Eisenmenger closes the exhaustive chapter with the words:

> "As said above, the vows and oaths sworn to a Christian or to the Christian magistrate, cannot be annulled, either by the annulment customary on the eve of the Day of Atonement, in Kol Nidre, or by a distinguished rabbi or three righteous men."
>
> (Bloch, *Israel and the Nations,* p. 278.)

CONCLUSION: JEWISH ETHICS

As stated in the Introduction, the passages under consideration have long figured in campaigns of defamation which antisemites have waged against the Jewish people. In 1885 the German Israelitish Union of Congregations answered them by issuing the following declaration of "Principles of Jewish Ethics," drawn up by Prof. Moritz Lazarus and endorsed and adopted by some 350 rabbis and teachers of religion, *of all shades of opinion,* and 270 Jewish jurists of Germany and Austria. This represents the true "Code of the Jew."

"1. Judaism teaches the unity of the human race. We all have one Father, one God created us.

"2. Judaism commands: 'Love thy neighbor as thyself,' and declares this command of all embracing love to be the fundamental principle of the Jewish religion.

"It therefore forbids every sort of animosity, envy, malevolence or unkindness towards any one of whatsoever race, nationality, or religion. It demands justice and righteousness, and forbids injustice, improbity, fraud, taking unfair advantage of the need, the heedlessness, and the inexperience of a fellowman, as well as usury and the usurious employment of the powers of a fellow-man.

"3. Judaism demands consideration for the life, health, powers, and possessions of one's neighbors.

"It therefore forbids injuring a fellow-man by force, or cunning, or in any other iniquitous manner, depriving him of his property, or leaving him helplessly exposed to unlawful attacks.

"4. Judaism commands holding a fellow-man's honor as sacred as one's own.

"It therefore forbids degrading him by evil reports, vexing him with ridicule, or mortifying him.

"5. Judaism commands respect for the religious conviction of others.

"It therefore forbids aspersion or disrespectful treatment of the religious customs and symbols of other religions.

"6. Judaism commands the practice of charity toward all, clothing the naked, feeding the hungry, nursing the sick, comforting those that mourn.

"It therefore forbids limiting our care to ourselves and our families and withholding sympathy when our neighbors suffer.

"7. Judaism commands respect for labor; each in his place shall

take part, by means of physical or mental labor, in the work of the community and strive for the blessings of life by busy, creative activity.

"It therefore demands the cultivation, development, and active employment of all our powers and capabilities.

"On the other hand, it forbids inactive enjoyment of life and idleness confident of support by others.

"8. Judaism commands absolute truthfulness; our yea shall be yea; our nay, nay.

"It therefore forbids distortion of truth, deceit, hypocrisy, double dealing, and dissimulation.

"9. Judaism commands walking humbly with God and in modesty among men.

"It therefore forbids self-conceit, arrogance, pride, presumptuousness, boasting, and disparagment of the merits of others.

"10. Judaism demands peaceableness, placability, mildness, benevolence. It therefore commands the return of good for evil, to suffer rather than to inflict injury.

"It therefore forbids taking revenge, nursing hatred, bearing a grudge, abandoning even an adversary in his helplessness.

"11. Judaism commands chastity and sanctity of marriage.

"It therefore forbids dissoluteness, license and relaxation of family ties.

"12. Judaism commands the conscientious observance of the laws of the State, respect for and obedience to the government.

"It therefore forbids rebellion against governmental ordinances and evasion of the law.

"13. Judaism commands the promotion of the welfare of one's fellow-men, the service of individuals and communities in accordance with one's ability.

"It therefore forbids slothful indifference to the common weal and selfish exclusion from the societies instituted for charitable purposes and for the betterment of mankind.

"14. Judaism commands that its adherents shall love the state, and willingly sacrifice property and life for its honor, welfare and liberty.

"15. Judaism commands sanctification of the name of God through acts, and it bids us exert ourselves to hasten the time in which men shall be united in the love of God and the love of one another." (Lazarus, *Jewish Ethics,* part I, p. 302-305.)

Distributed by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1602—130 N. Wells St., Chicago, Ill.

PROPERTY OF
ST. JOHN CANTIUS' SEMINARY
Congregation of the Resurrection

[Rare]
B1
648
.C64
1939

01 00[illegible] 0134 0353